



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,855	03/18/2004	Shigeru Okazaki	08830.0014	7721

7590 01/27/2005

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, ANTHONY H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ak

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,855

Applicant(s)

OKAZAKI, SHIGERU

Examiner

Anthony H Nguyen

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naramore et al. (US 5,630,578).

With respect to claims 1 and 4, Naramore et al. teaches a paper handling apparatus having a paper guide opening for receiving a paper from outside (Naramore et al., Fig 1, the indicated arrow on the left side of the Figure) and a paper discharge opening 21 and a coupling section 16, 42 for coupling to other paper handling at a position approximately equal to the paper guiding opening in a vertical direction as shown in Figs.1 and 6 of Naramore et al. With respect to claim 2, the coupling 16, 42 of Naramore et al. is arranged at two positions approximately symmetric to the center of the feeding path a shown in Fig.7.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 5-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Naramore et al. (US 5,630,578) in view of Sollitt (US 5,326,093).

With respect to claims 5, 6 and 10, Naramore et al. teaches all that is claimed, except the image system which includes an image forming apparatus, a paper feeding apparatus, and a paper post-processing apparatus. Sollitt teaches the conventional image system having a plurality of paper handling apparatuses 10, an image forming apparatus 12, a paper feeding apparatus in the image forming apparatus (no numeral reference) and the paper post-processing apparatus 11 (Sollitt, col. 14, lines 47-53). In view of the teaching of Sollitt, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the paper handling apparatus of Naramore et al. for use with the image system which includes an image forming apparatus, a paper feeding apparatus and a post-process apparatus as taught by Sollitt to improve the efficiency of printing on a paper. With respect to claim 3, the selection of a desired distance range between the coupling section and the paper guide opening would be obvious through routine experimentation in order to get best possible secured positions between the handling apparatus. With respect to claims 7-9, see the explanation regard to claims 1, 2 and 4 above. With respect to claim 12, the

Art Unit: 2854

use of two image forming apparatus for printing the first side and the second side of a paper is well known in the art.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Naramore et al. in view of Sollitt as applied to claims 3, 5-10 and 12 above, and further in view of Maruyama et al. (US 5,752,154).

Naramore et al. and Sollitt teach all that is claimed, except the displacement detection section for detecting a displacement of a paper. Maruyama et al. teaches an image forming apparatus having the conventional displacement detection section 1003 and 1004 (Maruyama et al., Figs 36-38) for detecting a displacement of paper as shown in Figs. 36-38 of Maruyama et al. In view of the teaching of Maruyama et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the image forming system of Naramore et al. and Sollitt by providing the displacement detection section as taught by Maruyama et al. to permit more precise control the paper in the feeding direction.

Conclusion

The patents to Inoue, Ikeda et al., Ishikawa et al. and Mirlieb et al. are cited to show other structures and methods having obvious similarities to the claimed structure and method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169.

The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (571) 272-2168.

Art Unit: 2854

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anthony Nguyen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anthony Nguyen

1/24/05

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2800